

JAN 24 2008

Application No. 10/698,332

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 7, 12, 16 are amended.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-20 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 7,171,629. A terminal disclaimer is being submitted herewith to obviate this rejection.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Independent claims 1, 7, 12, 16 have been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter and as a result the rejections to these claims are now moot. With regards to dependant claims 2-6, 8-11, 13-15, 17-18, in light of the amendments to independent claims 1, 7, 12, 16 these rejections are now traversed. Withdrawal of § 101 rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,654,785 to Craig in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,904,450 to King et al. The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose "a composer, wherein said composer composes a web slide show presentation through automatic extraction of web page details" or as recited in currently amended independent claims 1 and 7 with all the other elements of the claim.

Application No. 10/698,332

In the office action, the examiner suggests that "it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Craig and King before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system synchronized presentation slide of Craig to include the URLs web-browsing capabilities, as taught by King." However, neither Craig nor King et al. disclose an auto-composing web site access system that automatically extracts web page details at all.

Craig discloses that a presentation is started by "calling up and beginning the presentation by downloading the applet and a list of URLs that defines the presentation" (Craig, col. 3, ln. 58-62). Craig discloses that presentations "may be assembled simply by identifying information on the Web" (Craig, col. 4, ln. 17-20). Craig also discloses that the asserted invention makes use "of a predefined list of URLs that comprise a presentation" (Craig, col. 8, ln. 34-36). Craig discloses that in running an applet the browser "downloads the appropriate applet and a list of available lectures" (Craig, col. 9, ln.13-15). Craig also discloses that the invention is limited to "scanning a single directory for files ending in .lecture.html." (Craig, col. 14, ln. 16-18). Further Craig discloses that in each document defining the list "each data element occupies a single line" (Craig, col. 15, ln. 24-27) and suggests that files need to conform to a naming structure to be parsed for presentation data (".lecture.html", Craig, col. 16, ln.12). Thus, Craig discloses the manual composition of a presentation which is stored in HTML format at a specific location and utilizing an applet to display and synchronize the presentation. Nowhere does Craig disclose an auto-composing system with automatic extraction of web page details from a desired web page where details are hyperlinks, a presentation/rendition text file or a meta tag to define the runtime parameters of a presentation. The composing of a slideshow through automatic extraction of web page details in the manner taught by current independent claims 1 and 7 is fundamentally

Application No. 10/698,332

different from the manual composition of a presentation which is then stored in a file utilizing standard HTML format, with a specific name at a specific location as suggested by Craig in both function and execution.

King discloses a "site list [that] may be displayed to the user of a director in a slideshow like fashion" (King, col. 9, ln. 54-56). Further King discloses that a site "specified in site list may be displayed to the user of a director" (King, col. 9, ln. 29-33). Thus, King et al. discloses the display of sites in a predefined site list. Nowhere does King et al. disclose a performer displaying a web slide show presentation provided by the automatic extraction of web page details. It is respectfully submitted that King et al. teaches away from the claimed inventions because King et al. teaches that the site list is manually created and that the producer displays sites in this list in-order.

Thus, neither Craig nor King et al., separately or together, create a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In both Craig and King et al. the lists that provide the slides must be created manually and stored in a specific location. In contrast claims 1 and 7 of the current invention disclose auto-composition of a slide show by automatic extraction of web page details.

Furthermore, the proposed modification, as suggested by the Examiner, changes the principle of operation of a reference, as prohibited by MPEP §2143.01(VI). Craig teaches the utilization of Java and that the "Java security model constrains network connections to the host that served the original applet" (Craig, col. 9, ln. 37-40). Thus combining the references would require substantial reconstruction and redesign of the Craig reference and change the basic principle under which Craig was designed to operate. Therefore, the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious.

Application No. 10/698,332

Claims 12-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,654,785 to Craig in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,904,450 to King et al. further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,091,411 to Straub et al.

Straub discloses that the screen saver "shows channel-provided hypertext pages sequentially at intervals (similar to a slide show)." (Straub, col.15, ln.57-60) Nowhere does Straub teach or suggest an activator configured as a screen saver file, wherein said activator activates a composer to create a presentation wherein said presentation comprises a list of a plurality of URLs. For these reasons and the reasons stated above, neither Craig, King et al. or Straub et al. taken individually or as a whole establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. None of the disclosures disclose an activator that activates auto-composing a list of URLs for display in slideshow format as claimed in current independent claims 12 and 16.

It is respectfully, submitted that, independent claims 1, 7, 12, and 16, as amended are allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 2-6, 9-11, 13-15, and 17-20 are dependent on allowable independent claims and are allowable for at least the reasons claims 1, 7, 12, and 16 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Brad Pedersen
Registration No. 32,432

Application No. 10/698,332

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thuente, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 349-5774